



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/611,073	07/06/2000	Mike Katsanevas		5054

7590 12/04/2002
Marcus G Theodore
466 South 500 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

EXAMINER

LEE, DIANE I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2876

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/611,073

Applicant(s)

KATSANEVAS, MIKE

Examiner

Diane I. Lee

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 September 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 09 September 2002 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the Amendment filed 09 September 2002. Claims 1, 5, and 7-8 have been amended; and no claims have been newly added. Currently, claims 1-8 are pending in this application.

Drawings

2. Color photographs and color drawings are acceptable only for examination purposes unless a petition filed under 37 CFR 1.84(a)(2) is granted permitting their use as acceptable drawings. In the event that applicant wishes to use the drawings currently on file as acceptable drawings, a petition must be filed for acceptance of the color photographs or color drawings as acceptable drawings. Any such petition must be accompanied by the appropriate fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(h), three sets of color drawings or color photographs, as appropriate, and an amendment to the first paragraph of the brief description of the drawings section of the specification which states:

The patent or application file contains at least one drawing executed in color. Copies of this patent or patent application publication with color drawing(s) will be provided by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office upon request and payment of the necessary fee.

Color photographs will be accepted if the conditions for accepting color drawings have been satisfied.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2876

4. Claims 1-7 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eppich [US 4,084,214].

Re claims 1 and 4: Eppich teaches a bank card terminal cover 244 pervious to liquid, grease, and dust for a data terminal 10 comprising keypad 26; a card reader 148 having a card reading slot (34, 36); connector 96 for providing a power source to the data terminal. The data terminal dust cover 244 which is molded of polycarbonate resin that is a transparent and a rigid, crush resistant and liquid, dust, and grease impervious top with sidewalls defining an open bottom leading into an interior chamber sized to fit about and cover a bank card terminal that can be placed on a non-integral separate support surface (*i.e., the support surface being part of the base unit 12, which is a separate vertical non-integral surface from the card and providing support surface for the cover when it is place on the base unit 12*) independent of the bank card terminal and cover (see col. 5, lines 31+; figure 4 and 16). Wherein the data terminals cover 244 comprises top 246 with sides 248 defining an open bottom leading into an interior chamber sized to fit about and cover the data terminal when placed upon the non-integral separate support surface (recess 100 for the over unit 18 and end support surfaces 138, 140 for the dust over 244, see col. 2, lines 24+; col. 4, lines 11+ and 46+; col. 5, lines 31-42; col. 6, lines 31+; and col. 14, line 60-col. 16, line 28; and figures 1, 4, 6-7, 16-22). Eppich further shows in figures 1, 4, 6-11, and 18-19 that the side wall extending sufficiently about the terminal to contact the separate support surface to elevate the cover above and around the bank terminal to protect the bank card terminal from liquids, dust, grease, and falling object by directing them away from the bank card terminal onto the non-integral separate support surface.

Eppich is silent with respect to the cover "defining at least one opening through which a terminal cord may be inserted and connected to the bank card terminal".

It is well known in a variety of protective covers for electronic components to provide openings therethrough whereby power cords and other connectors may extend through. These arrangements

Art Unit: 2876

typically are employed to eliminate the possibility of damage to the cords as well as allow proper connection to power sources and appropriate peripheral devices.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the dust cover to place at least one opening through which a data terminal power cord may be inserted and connected to the data terminal 96. Accordingly, the above modification to the teachings of Eppich would have been an obvious matter of design variation, failing to provide any unexpected results, well within the ordinary skill in the art, and therefore an obvious expedient.

Re claim 2: Although Eppich discloses the dust cover which includes the means (i.e., hinges) 250 for mounting/attaching the dust cover to the data terminal (e.g., from the back side 248 of the dust cover (see fig. 16) and wherein the hinge allows the dust cover to pivotally open in a first mode to provide access to the data terminal keypad and card reading slot, and close in a second mode about the data terminal to prevent dust, moisture, etc. and other matters from interfering with the data terminal keypad and card reading slot, he fails to specifically teach that the top is operably mounted from the top of the dust cover.

Since applicant has not disclosed that the top cover operably mounted from the top of the dust cover solves any stated problem other than to open the terminal (first mode) to provide an access the terminal key pad and close the terminal (second mode) to prevent dust, grime, liquids, and etc., it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the hinge being mounted from the back side of the cover (see figure 16), it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to alternatively mount the dust cover from the top and/or the back side of the dust cover, so long as the hinge and cover is properly configured to allow the dust cover to properly pivot to an open position and in close position, as taught by Eppich.

Re claim 3: As to the dust cover including a handle on the top exterior to aid in removal of the top to access the data terminal keypad and card reading slot, a handle on the exterior surface of cover to open

Art Unit: 2876

or close it is notoriously old and well known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a conventional handle or the like to the teachings of Eppich in order to provide the means (i.e., means for grasping the handle or the like) to the operator for easy access to the keypad and the card reading slot of the data terminal. Therefore, such modification would have been an obvious design expedient, well within the ordinary skill in the art for its practicality and for its versatility.

Re claims 5-7: Eppich shows in figures 1 and 16-22 that the bottom sized base unit 12 to support and fit around the bottom of a bank card terminal with structure operably associated with the cover to seal thereto in a first mode and to open to provide access to the bank card terminal in a second mode.

Eppich is silent with respect to the open bottom of the cover side walls having a shock absorbing seal affixed.

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Eppich to attach a conventional and well-known rubber sealer or the like material to the open bottom of the cover side walls to absorb the shock and to prevent a damage to the internal components of the terminal when the in the cover is dropped inadvertently or accidentally. By providing such sealing would further prevent dust, liquid, grease, and etc. from penetrating into the terminal thereof. Therefore, such modification would have been an obvious expedient well within the ordinary skill in the art, for its practicality and for its versatility, as taught by Eppich.

5. Claim 8 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eppich in view of Eckel et al. [US 4,727,934-referred as Eckel]. The teachings of Eppich have been discussed above.

Although Eppich shows the mounting arranged of the bank card terminal (i.e., the bank card terminal placed on a plane surface or a non-integral support surface independent of the bank card terminal

Art Unit: 2876

and cover), he does not show the other types of mounting of the bank card terminal (i.e., the bank card terminal mounted on a vertical non-integral support surface).

Eckel teaches the data collection terminal having a cover 2-4, 10-1, 12-1 and wherein the terminal having a desk top mounting as well as a wall mounting.

It would have been an obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the conventional wall mounting arrangement of a terminal in the mounting arrange of the bank card terminal of Eppich for the benefit of maximizing the work space and providing a convenience to the operator of the bank card terminal (i.e., positioning the terminal to be easily seen and operated by the operator).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 09 September 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7. In response to applicant's argument with respect to Eppich reference that does not teach the force diverting structure as taught by applicant (see page 4, lines 6+); the examiner respectfully disagrees. Since applicant claims the cover with a closed top and extending sides defining an open bottom, which extends about and provides a barrier to protect bankcard terminals from falling object, liquids, dust, and grease. Eppich also discloses the cover with a closed top and extending sides defining an open bottom, which extends about and provides a barrier to protect bankcard terminals. Therefore, the structure of the card as taught by Eppich would obviously provide the function of providing a barrier to protect bankcard terminals from falling object, liquids, dust, and grease (see the discussion above).

8. In response to applicant's argument with respect to Eppich's dust cover does not shield the electronic device from objects dropped on it (see page 4, lines 23+) and does not direct liquids and dust away from the electronic device (see page 4, lines 29+); the examiner respectfully disagrees. Due to the

Art Unit: 2876

fact that the cover of Eppich having a **closed top** and extending sides defining an open bottom, which extends about and provides a barrier to protect bankcard terminals, the cover of Eppich would definitely shield the electronic device from objects, such as coins, pins, pens, and etc. dropped on the cover and as well as direct liquids and dust away from the electronic device (see the discussion above).

9. In response to applicant's argument with respect to the dust cover of Eppich mounted on a vertical non-integral support surface and the Eppich's dust cover does not direct the shocks upon modular onto the non-integral support surface (see page 5, lines 1+); the examiner respectfully disagrees. Eppich teaches that the data terminal dust cover 244 is comprises top 246 with sides 248 defining an open bottom leading into an interior chamber sized to fit about and cover the data terminal when placed upon the non-integral separate support surface and wherein *the support surface being part of the base unit 12, which is a separate vertical non-integral surface from the card and providing support surface for the cover when it is place on the base unit 12*. Therefore, the cover of Eppich obviously directs the shocks upon modular onto the non-integral support surface (see the discussion above).

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ray, Jr. [Des 237,754], Kameyama et al. [US 5,576,516], Cooper [US 5,163,870], and Song [US 5,682,993] discloses a cover for terminal.

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action

Art Unit: 2876

is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diane I. Lee whose telephone number is 703-306-3427. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30 AM to 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on 703-305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.



Diane I. Lee
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2876

December 2, 2002